

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

1. Objection to the specification:

The disclosure is objected to due to informalities.

5 **Response:**

Paragraphs [0005] and [0020] have been amended to correct these informalities.

Acceptance of the amended specification is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

10 Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Paik (US 6,275,696).

**Response:**

15 Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this claim rejection. The applicant would like to point out the patentable features of independent claims 1 and 11.

Claim 1 recites the limitations of:

20 “before the radio device changes frequencies from a current time slot to a next time slot the standby frequency channel parameters for the next time slot and the connection frequency channel parameters for the next time slot are stored in the first and second register sets respectively, such that the link state controller switches the multiplexer according to the link state of the radio device for the next time slot so that the selected frequency parameters are loaded into the working register set.”

25

On the other hand, Paik does not teach that “the link state controller switches the multiplexer according to the link state of the radio device for the next time slot so

that the selected frequency parameters are loaded into the working register set". Although Paik teaches storing frequency parameters into a plurality of buffers in column 5, lines 1-20, Paik does not teach or suggest switching to selected frequency parameters for the next time slot before the radio device changes frequencies from a current time slot to a next time slot.

Similarly, regarding claim 11, Paik does not teach the claimed limitation of: "inputting the selected frequency channel parameters into the frequency channel controller prior to the beginning of the next time slot for controlling the radio device during the next time slot."

Since Paik fails to teach all of the limitations contained within claims 1 and 11, Paik does not anticipate claims 1 and 11. Furthermore, claims 2-4, 7, 8, 10, and 13 are dependent on claims 1 and 11, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 11 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paik (US 6,275,696) in view of Bronte et al. (US 5,621,720, hereinafter "Bronte").

**Response:**

Claim 5 specifies that "the link state controller switches the multiplexer ahead of the next time slot by a predetermined RF settling time of the RF device." As stated in page 6 of the Office action dated 07/26/2006, Paik does not expressly disclose that the link state controller switches the multiplexer ahead of the next time slot by a predetermined RF settling time of the RF device.

Bronte teaches in column 54, lines 49-57 setting a packet transmission rate for a worst-case scenario for transmission. However, Bronte does not teach that a link state controller switches the multiplexer ahead of the next time slot by a predetermined RF settling time of the RF device. Therefore, claim 5 should be  
5 allowable over the combination of Paik and Bronte.

In addition, claim 5 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 5 is therefore respectfully requested.

10 4. Rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paik (US 6,275,696) in view of Brown et al. (US 6,366,622).

**Response:**

15 Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.  
Reconsideration of claim 6 is therefore respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paik (US  
20 6,275,696) in view of Anderson et al. (US 6,094,575).

**Response:**

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.  
Reconsideration of claim 9 is therefore respectfully requested.

25

6. Rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paik  
(US 6,275,696) in view of Humblet et al. (US 5,671,357).

Appl. No. 10/065,585  
Amtd. dated October 25, 2006  
Reply to Office action of July 26, 2006

**Response:**

Claim 12 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.  
Reconsideration of claim 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

5

In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

10 Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 10/25/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

15 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

20 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)